



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A GREAT CLASSICAL DICTIONARY.¹

The working apparatus of the classical student has been considerably increased by the publication of this work, which although not wholly above criticism, is yet a marked improvement upon any like work that has preceded it in the English language. We are much pleased with the issuing of a work of this kind, for its publication shows a demand for learning of a literary character and a gradual breaking away from the absolutely philological method of teaching that has been in vogue since the days of Franz Bopp. The valuable translation of Seyffert's Dictionary of Classical Antiquities was a welcomed addition in that it showed a tendency to drift away from present methods and the publication of Mr. Peck's work shows an increased tendency in the same direction. It is believed that such a work will have the beneficial effect of opening to the young mind a brighter side of the Classics, and, that when this brighter side is seen, the student will find a deeper interest in studying the great works of the Ancients than he finds at present. The great decline in classical study that has been going on for the past half century till more recent years, was consequent upon the long time spent in purely philological grinding without any regard being paid to the matter and style of the authors studied. This method was doubtless employed in the belief that, by building a strong foundation on the philological side, the student would be better enabled to grasp and appreciate the literary side; but, unfortunately, few ever succeeded in going so far on the philological side as to reap results sufficiently great to enable them to grasp and enjoy the literary side, and a vast majority of men left college without having obtained even a glimpse of the beautiful sky that lay behind the thick cloud of Philology.

¹ Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities. Edited by Harry Thurston Peck, M. A., Ph. D. Illustrated. Harper & Brothers. 1896.

Hence it is, that, while men of the eighteenth century read the Classics with ease and pleasure, the men of the nineteenth century have, in large numbers, not only turned from them, but have even headed a revolt, and we have heard on all sides the cry of "Down with the Classics"; while most college men, when graduation is once obtained, are glad to get as far away from Greek and Latin as possible, retaining none of those precious treasures that should haunt the memory of every student of the Classics, but only the bitterness of stammering through the declensions and conjugations, failure in composition and an almost insuperable inability to "put the words of an author together." If we were asked why this is so and why men do not now read Greek and Latin after college life is past, we are forced to answer that it is the result partly of different conditions of life, but mostly of the strictly philological study that has plagued our school-boy days. We do not desire to underrate the importance of philological work, for we believe a sound philological basis is an absolute essential to the thorough understanding and appreciation of the literary side of the Classics, but we should like to make a strong plea that these two sides, the philological and the literary, go henceforth hand in hand and be not so entirely divorced as in the past. In its infancy, perhaps, philology needed protection in order that it might be developed and give to us the splendid results that we are now enjoying, but it is no longer an infant industry, and even the most ardent philologist should be glad to lighten his labors with the brighter, more attractive and more useful side of his subject. Hence we say such a work brings us great pleasure, because we seem now on the high road toward studying the works of the ancients as literature and no longer as a means of clogging the intellect with a mass of peculiar forms and syntactical irregularities, and we trust that hereafter, those who study the classics, will feel that they have quaffed living water from a perennial spring rather than brine from a dead sea.

Passing now to a somewhat comprehensive review of the work, we shall first endeavor to acquaint the reader with its aim and scope by indicating its contents as set forth under nine general heads in the preface, namely: biography, including important personages in every sphere of effort, the Christian Fathers, and the great scholars and philologists down to our own time; mythology with all the important characters in Greek and Roman writers, a careful distinction of Greek from Roman myths and a separate article giving and describing the history of the different schools; geography embracing the latest views of ethnologists and anthropologists; history, giving the principal political events in the development of Greece and Rome; literature in every department, with some very interesting articles on Parody, Jokes, the Cento, Novel and Romance, the Alexandrian Canon, celebrated editions, important codices, Lexicography, Grammar etc., antiquities, including Amusements, Art, Costume, Domestic Life, Law, Music, Numismatics, Philosophy, Religion, Science, Epigraphy, Palæography, Text Criticism, and many other interesting topics: language, including Grimm's and Verner's Laws, Dialects, Pronunciations of Greek and Latin, Rhotacism, Sermo Plebeius etc.; bibliography, giving, as a rule, the latest and most helpful works under the different articles; and, lastly, illustrations, about 1500 in number, including, besides pictures of objects that have actually come down to us, restorations by famous archaeologists and also the ideal creations of modern sculptors and artists.

From this, it will be seen that the work is, as the editor characterizes it, truly encyclopædic. It contains 1701 pages of the usual dictionary size, printed in double columns, with clear type and on excellent paper, and the illustrations are, as a rule, very well executed. We regret, however, that the editor did not always see fit to designate the exact sources whence these were taken.

The editor has produced a book that is extremely valuable and a credit to American scholarship. The work is well

done, and we may add, marvellously well, for Mr. Peck was practically alone in his labors and was able to devote to it only those hours that could be spared from other exacting duties for nearly five years. But while we fully appreciate the difficulties of such a task, we feel it our duty to point out some of the blemishes that disfigure the work.

On p. xi., of the preface, the editor says that he has sought to give in the title the Latin form for the Greek, as the former is likely to be more familiar. We do not pose as pedants, but we wish Mr. Peck had discarded this antiquated and somewhat unscholarly method and given us Greek words in Greek dress. The great disadvantage in this Latinizing method adopted by Mr. Peck, is the shifting of accent, which is likely to prove more or less confusing to the younger students who use the dictionary. For instance, ἐγγύη in Greek is accented on the penult, while the Latinized form *engyé* is accented on the ultimate, and, as the latter form is the more prominent in the work, the Greek form being given only in brackets, this accentuation will impress the eye more strongly and the student will get an incorrect pronunciation of the word. Again, the same system being adopted for Latin neuters in *é*, the confusion will be increased for the uninitiated. There seems, moreover, no settled system for accenting Latin neuters in *e*, for we find such words both with and without the accent, *e. g.*, *bracchiâlé* p. 220 and *aurum lustrâle* p. 174. The result of this method is, therefore, a false impression of accentuation and pronunciation in both Greek and Latin. Moreover, if a strict rule of Greek forms for Greek words had been observed, many inconsistencies in the body of the book would have been avoided. Among these we may point out *Diomedé* p. 22, *Diomedé*, p. 20, *Diomed*, p. 839, *Diomedes* frequently. We also find *Tisaménus* and *Tisamenos*, *Rhypæ* and *Rhypes*, *Cyclops* (plural), and *Cyclopes*, *Thebé* and *Thebai*, *Pellene* and *Pellini*, *Aegion* and *Aegeum*, *lecythus* and *lekythus*, and many others too numerous to mention. Another needless confusion resulting from this method is

the transcription of Greek final *οι*, sometimes as *οι*, and sometimes as *i*, as for example in *Catharmi*, *Amimaspi* and in *Amphippoi*, *Argyrologoi*.

But the student of Greek has a much greater grievance than this, that he must often know not the Latin transcription merely, but the Latin equivalent, in order to gain the desired information. For example, the student, who happens to be reading the *Oidipous* at *Kolonos* of *Sophokles* and comes to the well-known *Ζηνὶ συνθάκος θρόνων Αἰδώς*, if he desire to know more about *Αἰδώς* than is found in his lexicon, must know the Latin word *Pudicitia*, no great knowledge, it is true but an inconvenience to which the student of Greek should not be subjected. A more difficult case is that of the word *οἶστρος*, for which the student must know the Latin equivalent *asilus*, a somewhat unusual word and if he happen to look up his native *gad-fly*, he is referred not to *asilus* but to *oestrus*, which is not found in the Dictionary at all. This serious defect, which places the Greek student at a great disadvantage and causes much loss of time, occurs quite frequently in the work, *e. g.*, *ὄπλα*, *ἔντεα*, *ψέλιον*, *ὄφεις*, etc.

This leads us to consider a peculiarly annoying lack of system in the matter of cross-references, by which we are sometimes referred to a second and even to a third word and still fail to find the needed information and we are also frequently referred to words that are not in the book. Examples of this are: *amphimallum*, under which we are referred to *tapes*, which is not in the Dictionary as a title, but the Latinized form *tapeté* is found instead; under *aphlaston*, the reader is referred to *navis* and though he read the entire article he will get no information; under *amphippoi* reference is made to *Desultores*, which should be *Desultor*, as this is found in the title; under *apotimēma*, we are referred to *Dos* and thence to *matrimonium*, under which no satisfactory information is given; under *Archias*, reference is made to *Licinius Archias*, but no *Licinius Archias* is found in the book; under *Architheorus*, we are re-

ferred to *Delia*, where the *θεωποι* are mentioned, but no information whatever is ventured as to *Architheorus*; under *Argyripa*, we are referred to *Arpi*, and when we have spent time and patience looking this up, we are rewarded by a reference back to *Argyripa*; many more such exasperating references could be cited, but it seems needless to prolong the list further. Perhaps it is not out of place here to note that a great deal of time and inconvenience could have been saved in the matter of references to a long article if the articles had been divided into sections and reference made to the proper section. As the case is at present, the advantage of having all subordinate details collected under the general head is materially lessened by the difficulty experienced in finding individual terms.

The omissions are numerous, but we have space to call attention only to a few of the most important. Many proper names, mentioned under the articles in this dictionary, are omitted, such as *Ocalia*, *Sidero* and *Teleuthas*; under *Argonautae*, we are sorry to see that only a few of the heroes, who accompanied Iason, are mentioned; under the article *Acrisius*, mention is made of *Mantitheus* and his daughter *Eurydice*, but further information about these personages is not given. The *Eratosthenes* made famous by his connection with the Thirty Tyrants and *Lysias's* Oration is not thought worthy of mention. There were several *Luculli* and a reader of *Cicero* would certainly like to know something of them, but only one is given in this book. The Greek author *Aeneas* finds no place here, nor does the *Ganymedes* who proclaimed *Arsinoe* queen, when *Cæsar* attacked *Alexandria*. Under *Corcyra*, we should have been glad to see some mention made of the prominent part the *Corcyrans* played in breaking the thirty years' truce and renewing the *Peloponnesian War*. Under *Corinth*, nothing is said about her action in either the *Persian* or *Peloponnesian Wars*. Under *Diana*, her famous temple at *Ephesus* is passed by in silence, though we find it duly mentioned under the article on *Ephesus*. Under *Helios*,

Aeetes is not mentioned as one of his sons, nor is he so designated under his own name. Under Ganymedes, it would have been well, if the editor had told us that both Pindar and Euripides regarded him as the son of Laomedon and not of Tros. Under Pelops, we regret very much not to see the story of Pindar, who refuses to "call one of the blessed gods cannibal" and accounts for the famous ivory shoulder in quite a different way and makes Pelops to be carried off by Poseidon, as Ganymedes was by Zeus.

In the matter of bibliography we might note that under Hellas no mention is made of Holm's History of Greece that is just now appearing, nor is the last edition of Symonds's Studies of the Greek poets cited under anthology. Lipsius's revision of Meier's Attischer Prozess is not given under *Diké*, which, by the way, we see no reason for misplacing, as one would most naturally look for the word among the "Dik's" not among the "Dic's." Under Horatius no mention is made of the translations by Bulwer and by Gladstone, both which, we think, deserve a passing notice. We might also add that no lists of manuscripts, are given under Antiphon, Lysias Isaeos and several other authors.

It is quite unfortunate that the Dictionary should have so many misprints, especially in the matter of accents and breathings on Greek words, of which latter we have noted upwards of a hundred. Among other misprints, we may call attention to a few of the most important: *Brune* for *Brunn* in the preface, p. ix; *Ensebius* for *Eusebius*; under Aeropé, in the sentence "were generally believed to be *her* sons," *her* should be *his*. *Prozess* p. 76, should be *Process*, and so in several places. *Attische*, p. 76, is a mistake in gender for *Attischer*; p. 560, Livy Epit., 140 should be Livy Epit., 142; p. 611 *Berwohner* should be *Bewohner*, and on the same page *et* should be *ut* in the phrase *cura et valeas*; under *clavis*, p. 362, the reference to Lysias should be §13, not Chapter 4; under the article Pindarus, p. 1262, *Herrmann* is for *Hermann*, and p. 1263, *Rumfel* is for *Rumpel*.

The English in many places is such as we should never have expected to come from Mr. Peck's pen. Throughout the book there is a morbid fondness for joining a relative clause by means of the conjunctions *and* and *but*, an inelegance condemned by all the best writers on Rhetoric, though we cannot deny that good authority can be cited for its usage. Worse than this, however, is the bad management of the relative pronoun in general, of which we shall cite a few of the most striking instances. For example, on p. 24 under Aegobulus, *whom* is certainly not meant, as it was impossible to sacrifice the same youth every year; on p. 68, under Amphion, we find *a bull, who*, with no personification to relieve the harshness; p. 396, under Commodus; "The son and successor of M. Aurelius Antoninus, who ascended the imperial throne in A. D. 180," but we know that Marcus Aurelius did not ascend the imperial throne in A. D. 180. Among other errors, we may call attention to the constantly used expression "The Iliad and Odyssey," the use of *none* with a plural verb (p. 341), the frequent use of *after* as an adverb, and the use of *less* for *fewer* (p. 410); also the use of *whole* for *all* on pp. 508-9. Under Aristæus, the use of *latter*, although three persons are mentioned makes Orpheus to be bitten by the serpent, while we know it was Eurydice. Under *Daduchus*, the peculiar English makes the initiated to carry the torch, which was really carried by the person who led them. Under Faustina II, the wording is so peculiarly infelicitous that it is almost impossible to bring order out of chaos. It is very unfortunate that a book of so serious a character should be marred by such slipshod English, for these instances are only a few of the many that we have noted in our reading.

It is somewhat strange that the editor, after having told us under Cnosus that the spelling with one *s* is the best, should jump about from *Cnosus* to *Cnossus* and even to *Gnossus*, all of which inconsistencies could have been avoided by adopting the Greek form *Knosos*. Under Apollonius of Tralles, we are told that he is joint author with his

countryman Tauriscus, of the celebrated group of the *Laocoön*, for which the editor doubtless meant the *Farnese Bull*. Under Aristaeus, we are told that he fell in love with Orpheus's wife Eurydice, who, while trying to escape from him, was bitten by a serpent, without a word of warning that Aristaeus's connection with this legend goes no further back than Virgil, until we read the article on Orpheus, though the same story is repeated under Eurydice. Under Callinus, we are told that he is the creator of *political* elegy, which honor we have always ascribed to Solon, deeming Callinus sufficiently honored in the title of creator of *martial* elegy, of which kind of poetry, he is certainly the earliest writer that we know, even if he be not the creator. Under Clearchus, we are informed that he and the other generals, who accompanied Cyrus in his expedition against his brother, were put to death, but we know that only five of the generals were betrayed and suffered this fate. We should have been glad to see under Clytaemnestra Horace's version of the birth of the twin sisters and twin brothers in the well-known line. (Sat. II. 1. 26).

"Castor gaudet equis, ovo prognatus eodem
Pugnis."

Under Cornelia Orestilla reference is made to Orestilla, where she has her correct name, *Aurelia*. Under the article *Crux*, after a long dissertation on the abstention of the Greeks from the horrors of bodily torture and outrage, in which Mr. Peck seems to refer all such atrocities to the outlying regions, he says: "but no such horrors are mentioned in Greece proper, where even Helots and serfs ranked as Hellenes." We are sure that it would be difficult to prove this statement, although we should be glad to see it done, for we know too well that slaves were tortured and in the well-known 7th oration of Lysias about the Sacred Olive Stump the defendant says that he had offered his slaves for torture in the presence of witnesses. In the well-known Parabasis of the Peace of Aristophanes, he claims the honor of placing comedy on a higher plane in the following words:

"And freedom he gave to the lachrymose slave, who was wont with a howl to rush in

And all for the sake of a joke which they make on the wounds that disfigure his skin."

Moreover, in the *Frogs*, 617, he gives us a list of the particular tortures employed and closes with the weighty words *ἅντα ἀπῆλλα*, while in the *Lysistrata*, it is distinctly stated that polluted women must be burned to a cinder. Torture is also mentioned by Anacreon, Antiphon and Demosthenes. Under *Cyrillus*, in the beginning of the article, we are told that his works are not numerous, while at the close of the article we find the following: "He was the author of a large number of works, many of which are extant." Under *Delos*, *Poseidon* is said to have made the island stand firm, while under *Leto*, this duty is correctly assigned to *Zeus*, who caused the island to appear and stand firm in order to receive the wandering *Leto*. Mr. Peck seems to have confused the Greek *doryphori* with *misthophori*, since he gives no information about the former at all, but refers to the Latin *mercenarii*, where, however, the *doryphori* are not mentioned. Some of the *doryphori*, forming the body-guards of kings were doubtless mercenaries in the true sense, but this could hardly be said of the "spear-bearing companions" mentioned in the *Choi-phoroi* of *Aischylos*. Under the article *fælis*, the reader is told that "cats first appear in literature as house animals about the 4th century A. D.," and yet in the beginning of the same article we find these words: "cats were domesticated by the Egyptians as early as the 13th century B. C." Perhaps we do not exactly understand what Mr. Peck means by "appear in literature," for certainly *Herodotos* devotes the whole of the 66th chapter of the second book to cats and they are also mentioned by *Aristophanes*, *Anaxandrides* and *Timokles*. On page 837, under the article *Homerus*, it is said that the division of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* into 24 books each is ascribed to *Zenodotos*, and yet, if we turn to *Aristarchos*, we shall find him credited with this honor, though under *Zenodotos*, no mention is made of his

connection with the division ; the question is certainly an open one, but it would be better to state this in both places or make only one of these editors responsible for the division. Under Metoeci, it is a mistake that the decree of *ισοτέλεια* gave the metics the right to hold property in land, for this was obtained only by a distinct decree. Under Olympus, the reader is told that Homer *implies* that the clouds are the gates of heaven, and guarded by the Hours, but we are inclined to believe that a careful reading of the passage (Il. 5, 749-52) will convince anyone that Homer makes a distinct statement. Under Rhodes we regret very much to see no mention of the story of its birth, which is so prettily told by Pindar in the seventh Olympian.

The above criticism has been made from a careful reading of the book, and as we have found much more to commend than to condemn, it is but just to call attention to several articles, filling about 130 pages, and written by specialists whom Mr. Peck had associated with him as collaborators. Especial praise must be given to the article on the Twelve Tables by Allen, on Terence by Ashmore, Umbria by Buecheler, Sermo Plebeius by Cooper, Ennius and the Senecas by Cruttwell, Persia by Geldner, Pindarus by Gildersleeve, the articles on Abbreviations by Gudeman, Pompeii by Lanciani, India by Lanman, Lexicon by Lewis, Homerus by Seymour, Grimm's Law and Verner's Law by Wheeler, and on Boulé, Mycenae, Propylaea and Tiryns by Tarbell. As Mr. Peck declares himself solely responsible for all else in the book, it is impossible to do more than mention a few of his longer and more important articles and we should call attention especially to those on Balneum, Cena, Dialects, Domus, Graffiti, Musica and Theatrum and also to the many biographical sketches of the famous scholars and philologists, a decidedly pleasant and interesting feature of the Dictionary.

We must pronounce the work as a whole eminently successful, and the editor deserves our especial gratitude for his efforts to extent classical culture and to show the "essen-

tial modernity of the past" by collecting in a single volume in alphabetical order all that relates to the religion and life, art and literature of the Greeks and Romans. Mr. Peck has made accessible to the masses what was heretofore only possible for the few to glean and then at considerable expense of time and money, and we trust that the Dictionary will find its way not only to our Public Libraries and to the shelves of all classical scholars and students, but also to the private libraries of those who are interested in liberal culture.

CHAS. W. BAIN.